UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,584	01/18/2002	Parimal Vadhar	D-43489-01 US	9718

7590 03/29/2004

Mark B. Quatt
Cryovac, Inc.
P.O. Box 464
Duncan, SC 29334

EXAMINER	
MADSEN, ROBERT A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1761	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/051,584	VADHAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Madsen	1761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/11/02, 7/30/02, 11/13/02, 4/24/03, 5/12/03, 8/18/03
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant is advised that should claims 11-14 be found allowable, claims 15-20 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being substantial duplicates, respectively, thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> ((a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1,2,4,5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443).

4. Sugimoto teaches placing frozen foods into a lower web made of polypropylene as recited in claim 2 (Paragraphs 1-6,30 of English Translation), draping a top web over the food (e.g. note the top web's proximity to the food in Figure 1) wherein the top web comprises an oxygen barrier of polyester (e.g. PET as the base material in paragraph 19 and a sealant layer of ethylene/1-octene copolymer(Paragraphs 9-15, 30,Example 1 in Paragraph 31 in light of Table 1), as recited in claims 4 and 5, such that the peel strength before cooking (i.e. at 23°C) is at least 4 lb/in (i.e. 18-19N/ 15 mm for Example

1 in table 1) and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e.0.5-0.7 N/15 mm for Example 1 in Table 1) after cooking (i.e. at 95°C) as recited in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443) as applied to claims 1,2,4 and 5 above, further in view of Simon (US 4925684).

7. Regarding claim 3, Sugimoto teaches the sealant layer of the bottom web may comprise polypropylene (PP) , copolymers of alpha olefins, or other thermoplastics (Paragraph 21). Sugimoto also teaches the sealant layer thermoplastics for top web include ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA), and such thermoplastics are desirably mixed with PP (Paragraphs 11-13). Sugimoto further teaches the top layer has an oxygen barrier layer, as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1,2,4, and 5. However, Sugimoto is silent in teaching the bottom web sealant is 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP and that the bottom web comprises an oxygen barrier layer.

8. With respect to the actual sealant composition of 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP, to select any particular ratio of EVA to PP would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired peel strength since Sugimoto teaches the preferred

peel strength properties of the container and the preferred blends to use include PP with EVA. One would have merely been substituting specific sealant blend for another for the same purpose: obtaining the desired peel strength.

9. With respect to including a bottom web having an oxygen barrier layer with a sealant, Simon also teaches a microwaveable food package with a bottom web and top web wherein the top web forms a seal having a peel strength of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. at least 5.2 kg/ in) prior to microwave heating and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e. preferably below 1.3 g/in) after microwave heating (Column 2, lines 34-68, Column 5, lines 17- 36, Column 8, lines 48-55). Simon is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of (1) providing an oxygen barrier in the bottom web such as EVOH , to prevent oxygen from entering the container(Column 4, lines 14-20) and (2) providing a sealant layer on either the top or bottom webs (Column 3, line 56 to Column 4, line 2, Column 4, lines 55-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Sugimoto and include an oxygen barrier in the bottom web since Sugimoto teaches a food container with a top web having an oxygen barrier and Simon teaches providing an oxygen will prevent oxygen from entering the bottom web. It would have been further obvious to include the sealant layer of Sugimoto on the bottom web since Simon teaches a peelable sealant layer may be applied to either the top or bottom web. One would have been substituting one conventional bottom web design for another for the same purpose: providing a microwaveable food container having a peelable sealant layer that diminishes in strength after cooking in the microwave.

10. Claims 1- 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon (US 4925684) in view of Fisher et al. (US 4911938).

11. Regarding claims 1,2,4,Simon teaches a microwaveable food package with a bottom web and top web wherein the top web forms a seal having a peel strength of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. at least 5.2 kg/ in) prior to microwave cooking and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e. preferably below 1.3 g/in) after microwave cooking such that the lid self-vents during cooking (Column 2, lines 34-68, Column 5, lines 17- 36, Column 8, lines 48-55). The top web includes a sealant layer comprising ethylene/propylene copolymers in combination and an oxygen barrier layer of polyamides , as recited in claim 4, and the lower web includes polypropylene as recited in claim 2 (Column 4, lines 3-45 and Column 4, line 63to Column 5, line 16) . Simon teaches the top web may include a composition such that it may be used for browning during microwave cooking, wherein browning is further assisted by the self-venting feature (Column 6, lines 56-63, column 8, lines 48-55). Although Simon teaches the top web is draped over the food, Simon is silent in teaching the top web substantially conforms to the shape of the food as recited in claim 1.

12. Fisher also teaches a microwaveable food package with a top and bottom web wherein the peel strength diminishes after microwave cooking. Fisher further teaches browning the food in the package. Fisher teaches in order to achieve sufficient browning it is necessary to not only drape the top web over the food, but substantially confirming the web to the shape of the food will assure that the browning is completed more uniformly and selected releaseability of the upper web operates as expected

(Abstract, Column 4, lines 18-50,Column 4, line 52 to Column 5, line 3, and, Column 6, lines 8-23).

13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Simon and provide a top web substantially conforms to the shape of the food, since Simon teaches browning the food in the container is enhanced by the self-venting and Fisher teaches that browning and venting in a top/bottom web self-venting structure is enhanced by assuring the web substantially conforms to the shape of the food. One would have been substituting one conventional top web placement for another for the same purpose: a self-venting top web/bottom web structure used for browning and cooking food in the microwave.

14. Regarding claim 3, Simon teaches polypropylene (PP)as an adhesive layer as well as ethylene vinyl acetate copolymer (EVA) and preferably blends of PP and other resins as the top web sealant layer (Column 4, line 63 to Column 5, line7) and a bottom web having an oxygen barrier such as EVOH (Column 4, lines 14-20) wherein the bottom web may comprise the peelable seal layer (Column 3, line 56 to Column 4, line 2, Column 4, lines 55-56) , but Simon is silent in teaching the sealant is 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP. However, to select any particular combination or quantity of resins taught by Simon in combination with PP would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired peel strength since Simon (1) teaches the preferred peel strength to self vent during cooking and (2) teaches preferred sealant compositions to achieve the desired peel strength include PP in combination with other

resins such as EVA. One would have merely been substituting specific sealant blend for another for the same purpose: obtaining the desired peel strength.

15. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon (US 4925684) in view of Fisher et al. (US 4911938), as applied to claims 1-4 above, further in view of Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443).

16. Regarding claim 5, Simon teaches the top web sealant may include ethylene copolymer, but is silent in teaching the specific ethylene 1-octene copolymer.

17. Sugimoto also teaches a microwaveable food package that has top web sealant layer comprising polypropylene and ethylene copolymers that has a peel strength before cooking of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. 18-19N/ 15 mm for Example 1 in table 1) and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e.0.5-0.7 N/15 mm for Example 1 in Table 1) after cooking (Paragraphs 1-9, 30). Sugimoto further teaches a sealant layer compatible with these properties may include ethylene 1-octene copolymer (i.e. Example 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Simon and include an ethylene 1-octene copolymer in the sealant layer since one would have been substituting one conventional ethylene copolymer for another for the same purpose: providing a peelable sealant layer for a top web of a microwaveable food package such that the peel strength is reduced after heating and the ethylene copolymer is blended with polypropylene.

18. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon (US 4925684) in view of Fisher et al. (US 4911938).

19. Regarding claims 6-9, Simon teaches a microwaveable food package with a bottom web and top web wherein the top web forms a seal having a peel strength of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. at least 5.2 kg/ in) prior to microwave cooking and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e. preferably below 1.3 g/in) after microwave cooking such that the lid self-vents during cooking (Column 2, lines 34-68, Column 5, lines 17- 36, Column 8, lines 48-55). The top web includes a sealant layer comprising ethylene/propylene copolymers in combination and an oxygen barrier layer of polyamides , as recited in claim 4, and the lower web includes polypropylene as recited in claim 2 (Column 4, lines 3-45 and Column 4, line 63 to Column 5, line 16) . Simon teaches the top web may include a composition such that it may be used for browning during microwave cooking, wherein browning is further assisted by the self-venting feature (Column 6, lines 56-63, column 8, lines 48-55). Simon teaches polypropylene (PP)as seal layer as well as ethylene vinyl acetate copolymer (EVA) and preferably blends of PP and other resins as the top web sealant layer (Column 4, line 63 to Column 5, line7) and a bottom web having an oxygen barrier such as EVOH (Column 4, lines 14-20) wherein the bottom web may comprise the peelable seal layer, as recited in claim 8 (Column 3, line 56 to Column 4, line 2, Column 4, lines 55-56) Although Simon teaches the top web is draped over the food and although Simon teaches the bottom layer may contain a sealant including blends of PP and EVA, Simon is silent in teaching the top web substantially conforms to the shape of the food and the bottom web sealant is 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP as recited in claims 6 and 8.

20. With respect to having the top web conform to the shape of the food, Fisher also teaches a microwaveable food package with a top and bottom web wherein the peel strength diminishes after microwave cooking. Fisher further teaches browning the food in the package. Fisher teaches in order to achieve sufficient browning it is necessary to not only drape the top web over the food, but substantially confirming the web to the shape of the food will assure that the browning is completed more uniformly and selected releaseability of the upper web operates as expected (Abstract, Column 4, lines 18-50,Column 4, line 52 to Column 5, line 3, and, Column 6, lines 8-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Simon and provide a top web substantially conforms to the shape of the food, since Simon teaches browning the food in the container is enhanced by the self-venting and Fisher teaches that browning and venting in a top/bottom web self-venting structure is enhanced by assuring the web substantially conforms to the shape of the food. One would have been substituting one conventional top web placement for another for the same purpose: a self-venting top web/bottom web structure used for browning and cooking food in the microwave.

21. With respect to the particular sealant composition of 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP, to select any particular combination or quantity of resins taught by Simon in combination with PP would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired peel strength since Simon (1) teaches a preferred peel strength to self vent during cooking and (2) teaches preferred sealant compositions to achieve the desired peel strength include PP in combination with other resins such as EVA. One would

have merely been substituting specific sealant blend for another for the same purpose: obtaining the desired peel strength.

22. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon (US 4925684) in view of Fisher et al. (US 4911938), as applied to claims 6-9 above, further in view of Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443).

23. Regarding claim 10, Simon teaches the top web sealant may include ethylene copolymer, but is silent in teaching the specific ethylene 1-octene copolymer.

24. Sugimoto also teaches a microwaveable food package that has top web sealant layer comprising polypropylene and ethylene copolymers that has a peel strength before cooking of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. 18-19N/ 15 mm for Example 1 in table 1) and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e.0.5-0.7 N/15 mm for Example 1 in Table 1) after cooking (Paragraphs 1-9, 30). Sugimoto further teaches a sealant layer compatible with these properties may include ethylene 1-octene copolymer (i.e. Example 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Simon and include an ethylene 1-octene copolymer in the sealant layer since one would have been substituting one conventional ethylene copolymer for another for the same purpose: providing a peelable sealant layer for a top web of a microwaveable food package such that the peel strength is reduced after heating and the ethylene copolymer is blended with polypropylene.

25. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443) in view of Simon (US 4925684).

26. Regarding claims 6,7,9 and 10, Sugimoto teaches placing frozen foods into a lower web made of polypropylene as recited in claim 7 (Paragraphs 1-6,30 of English Translation), draping a top web over the food (e.g. note the top web's proximity to the food in Figure 1) wherein the top web comprises an oxygen barrier of polyester (e.g. PET as the base material in paragraph 19) and a sealant layer comprising polypropylene(PP) in combination with ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA) or ethylene/1-octene copolymer (Paragraphs 9-15, 30,Example 1 in Paragraph 31 in light of Table 1), as recited in claims 9 and 10, such that the peel strength before cooking (i.e. at 23°C) is at least 4 lb/in (i.e. 18-19N/ 15 mm for Example 1 in table 1) and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e.0.5-0.7 N/15 mm for Example 1 in Table 1) after cooking (i.e. at 95°C). However, Sugimoto is silent in teaching the bottom web sealant is 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP as recited in claim 6.

27. With respect to the actual sealant composition of 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP, to select any particular ratio of EVA to PP would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired peel strength since Sugimoto teaches a particular desired peel strength obtainable using preferred blends to use include PP with EVA. One would have merely been substituting specific sealant blend for another for the same purpose: obtaining the desired peel strength.

28. With respect to including a sealant layer on the bottom web, Simon also teaches a microwaveable food package with a bottom web and top web wherein the top web forms a seal having a peel strength of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. at least 5.2 kg/ in) prior to microwave heating and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e. preferably below 1.3 g/in) after

microwave heating (Column 2, lines 34-68, Column 5, lines 17- 36, Column 8, lines 48-55). Simon teaches providing a sealant layer on either the top or bottom webs is equivalent (Column 3, line 56 to Column 4, line 2, Column 4, lines 55-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the sealant layer of Sugimoto on the bottom web since Simon teaches a peelable sealant layer may be applied to either the top or bottom web. One would have been substituting one conventional bottom web design for another for the same purpose: providing a microwaveable food container having a peelable sealant layer that diminishes in strength after cooking in the microwave.

29. Regarding claim 8, although Sugimoto teaches the top web has an oxygen barrier layer, as discussed above, modified Sugimoto is silent in teaching the bottom layer includes an oxygen barrier layer. Simon is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of providing an oxygen barrier in the bottom web such as EVOH , to prevent oxygen from entering the container(Column 4, lines 14-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Sugimoto and include an oxygen barrier in the bottom web since Sugimoto teaches a food container with a top web having an oxygen barrier and Simon teaches providing an oxygen will prevent oxygen from entering the bottom web. One would have been substituting one conventional bottom web design for another for the same purpose: providing a microwaveable food container having a peelable sealant layer that diminishes in strength after cooking in the microwave.

30. Claims 11,12,14, 15,16,17,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443) in view of Campbell (EP 0334670).

31. Regarding claims 11,12,14, 15,16,17,19,20, Sugimoto teaches placing frozen foods into a lower web made of polypropylene as recited in claims 12 and 17 (Paragraphs 1-6,30 of English Translation), draping a top web over the food (e.g. note the top web's proximity to the food in Figure 1) wherein the top web comprises an oxygen barrier of polyester (e.g. PET as the base material in paragraph 19) and a sealant layer of ethylene/1-octene copolymer(Paragraphs 9-15, 30,Example 1 in Paragraph 31 in light of Table 1), as recited in claims 14, 15,19,20, such that the peel strength before cooking (i.e. at 23°C) is at least 4 lb/in (i.e. 18-19N/ 15 mm for Example 1 in table 1) and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e.0.5-0.7 N/15 mm for Example 1 in Table 1) after cooking (i.e. at 95°C) as recited in claims 11 and 16. However, Sugimoto are silent in teaching a vacuum skin package.

32. Campbell also teach frozen foods packaged in a container comprising a top web for heating in the microwave. Campbell teaches by vacuum skin packaging will prevent freezer burn by removing air from the container (Abstract, Column 1, lines 1-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Sugimoto and utilize a vacuum skin packaging process since Sugimoto teaches frozen foods and Campbell teaches vacuum skin packaging will prevent freezer burn. One would have been substituting one conventional top web sealing process for another for microwaveable frozen food package.

33. Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto (JP 2001-310443) in view of Campbell (EP 0334670) as applied to

claims 11,12,14, 15,16,17,19,20 above, further in view of further in view of Simon (US 4925684).

34. Regarding claim 13 and 18, Sugimoto teaches the sealant layer of the bottom web may comprise polypropylene (PP) , copolymers of alpha olefins, or other thermoplastics (Paragraph 21). Sugimoto also teaches the sealant layer thermoplastics for top web include ethylene vinyl acetate (EVA), and such thermoplastics are desirably mixed with PP (Paragraphs 11-13). Sugimoto further teaches the top layer has an oxygen barrier layer, as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1,2,4, and 5. However, Sugimoto is silent in teaching the bottom web sealant is 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP and that the bottom web comprises an oxygen barrier layer.

35. With respect to the actual sealant composition of 60-90% EVA and 10-40% PP, to select any particular ratio of EVA to PP would have been an obvious matter of design choice depending on the desired peel strength since Sugimoto teaches the preferred peel strength properties of the container and the preferred blends to use include PP with EVA. One would have merely been substituting specific sealant blend for another for the same purpose: obtaining the desired peel strength.

36. With respect to including a bottom web having an oxygen barrier layer with a sealant, Simon also teaches a microwaveable food package with a bottom web and top web wherein the top web forms a seal having a peel strength of at least 4 lb/in (i.e. at least 5.2 kg/ in) prior to microwave heating and less than 2.5 lb/in (i.e. preferably below 1.3 g/in) after microwave heating (Column 2, lines 34-68, Column 5, lines 17- 36, Column 8, lines 48-55). Simon is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of (1)

providing an oxygen barrier in the bottom web such as EVOH , to prevent oxygen from entering the container(Column 4, lines 14-20) and (2) providing a sealant layer on either the top or bottom webs (Column 3, line 56 to Column 4, line 2, Column 4, lines 55-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Sugimoto and include an oxygen barrier in the bottom web since Sugimoto teaches a food container with a top web having an oxygen barrier and Simon teaches providing an oxygen will prevent oxygen from entering the bottom web. It would have been further obvious to include the sealant layer of Sugimoto on the bottom web since Simon teaches a peelable sealant layer may be applied to either the top or bottom web. One would have been substituting one conventional bottom web design for another for the same purpose: providing a microwaveable food container having a peelable sealant layer that diminishes in strength after cooking in the microwave.

Conclusion

37. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Freschi et al. (EP 0595442 A1) and Longo (WO 9954398 A1) teach easy to open vacuum skin packaging. Suzuki et al. (US 5178293) teach sealant layers designed to weaken after heat treatment Hwo (US 4666778) and Hwo (US 4759984) teach the recited sealant layer composition.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

39. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

40. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Madsen
Examiner
Art Unit 1761

MILTON I. CANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700